IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI BILAL NAZKI, THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

and
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 20082 of 2005

Between:

Nirneetha (Regd No.6673 of 2000)

Rep by its Chairman, T.K.Sreedhar ,

S/o.T.K.Kodandaram, R/o.6-1-355,

Walker Town, Padmarao Nagar, Secunderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Govt of India, Rep by its Secretary,

Human Resources Department,

New Delhi, and 59 others.

.....RESPONDENTS

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Bilal Nazki, The Acting Chief Justice)

This is a petition filed in public interest by petitioner-Voluntary organization,

represented by an Advocate of this Court. Following reliefs have been claimed:

> '1. direct respondents 1 to 7 to take appropriate steps for the improvement of the quality of legal education;
>
> 2. direct respondents 9 to 16 to take all necessary steps to make the members of the faculty to attend classes and to address the students;
>
> 3. direct the teachers not to mark 'attendance' to such students who do not attend the classes;
>
> 4. direct the university authorities to keep a watch on the performance of each and every teacher to ensure attendance of students and to ensure quality of teaching;
>
> 5. issue directions to the principals of the colleges to send the names of such teachers, who fail to attend the classes regularly and who mark the attendance to the students who do not attend classes;
>
> 6. issue necessary directions to the concerned universities to withdraw the hostel facilities and scholarships extended to the students who fail to attend the classes without proper reasons;
>
> 7. issue a direction to the concerned universities to take necessary steps for strict evaluation of the papers and to take disciplinary action against those teachers who resort to give marks to the undeserving students who fail to verify, write answers to the respective questions.
>
> 8. issue necessary direction to the authorities of the universities to introduce revaluation of the papers to enable the students to get the papers revaluated in the event of their entertaining a doubt for getting lesser marks in the respective examinations.
>
> 9. direct the university authorities to introduce the system of random checking of the answer papers evaluated by other examiners by a team of expert examiners to prevent the teachers from giving marks to undeserving students.
>
> 10. direct the State Government to establish a law university bringing all the law colleges under one umbrella for close monitoring of the functioning of all the law colleges under the direct supervision of A.P. High Court in the State of A.P. on similar lines of N.T.R. Health University where entire medical education in the State of Andhra Pradesh was brought under one umbrella to give uniform treatment to all the students in the entire State of Andhra Pradesh.
>
> 11. In the event of the State Government expressing its inability to constitute a Supreme Body to supervise the academic activities of

all the law colleges, to make a surprise visit, to suggest changes in the syllabus, to recommend to take action against the teachers who resort to mark 'present' for those students who do not attend the colleges, to recommend to the concerned authorities to take action against the examiners, who liberally value the papers unmindful of the fact that such students do not deserve any marks at all, to make the Chief Justice of Andhra Pradesh High Court as the Chief Patron of such Supreme Body, two other Judges from the High Court as members of such body, Secretary, Higher Education, Secretary, Law, two representatives of the teaching faculty, two representatives of the student community, two representatives from the legal practitioners, two representatives from parents and two representatives from the general public, and to nominate the Principal District Judge or his representative as the head of the monitoring Committee for each District with the Principal of the respective law college, and two members of the local Bar to authorize the said body to make surprise visits to law colleges and to report the observations to the supreme body.'

Going by the reliefs itself, we are of the view that this Court cannot be asked to undertake such an exercise, and give directions as sought for. If the petitioner has any suggestions to make, he can make them to the concerned authorities.

Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

(Bilal Nazki, A.C.J)

13th September, 2005

(R.Subhash Reddy, J)

LUR